UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/723,784	11/26/2003	Jit Fu Ang	01013.0105	9062	
	26712 7590 10/15/2008 HODGSON RUSS LLP			EXAMINER	
	TY BUILDING	WONG, LESLIE A			
SUITE 100	140 PEARL STREET SUITE 100		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
BUFFALO, NY 14202-4040			1794		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/15/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/723,784	ANG ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Leslie Wong	1794
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ID. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 (2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is FINAL . Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-12 and 18-32 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-12 and 18-32 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.	
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	ier.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by the edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ction is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat ority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

Application/Control Number: 10/723,784

Art Unit: 1794

In view of the appeal brief filed on July 23, 2008, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY

Page 2

REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the

following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply

under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed

by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and

appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth

in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant

must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by

signing below.

/Milton I. Cano/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent

granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the

applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-10, 12, and 18-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Van Lengerich (US 2007/0141096).

Van Lengerich teaches a food containing an encapsulated anti-caking agent wherein calcium carbonate, sodium carbonate, magnesium carbonate, potassium carbonate, and sodium bicarbonate are encapsulated with a hydrophobic material such as fats, oils, and waxes (see entire document, especially claims 1, 15, 16, 25, and 28). Van Lengerich also teaches a particle range of 0.1 mm to about 10 mm and about 5% by weight to about 50% by weight of the hydrophobic material based on the matrix material (see claim 19 and paragraph 0021).

The claims differ as to the specific recitation of a moisture content greater than 20%.

The moisture content would be no more than inherent and/or obvious to the food products of Van Lengerich as the foods include yogurts, desserts, puddings, custards, and ice creams (see paragraph 0071).

Claims 4, 7, 11, and 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Lengerich (US 2007/0141096) in view of Patel et al (US 6923988) and Koellmann et al (NL 1004792C as cited by Applicant).

Van Lengerich is cited as above.

The claims differ as to the specific use in cheese and the encapsulation method.

Koellmann et al disclose the use of carbonates in cheese products (see abstract).

Patel et al disclose conventional methods of encapsulation including extrusion, spray drying, melting, mixing, spray chilling, and fluidized bed (see entire document, especially column 4, lines 14-24 and column 39, lines 44-52).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to use the encapsulated carbonate as taught by Van Lengerich in a cheese product as taught by Koellmann et al and to encapsulate using conventional encapsulation techniques as taught by Patel et al because the use of carbonates in cheese and the claimed extrusion methods are conventional in the art. Applicant is using known components and process steps for their art-recognized function to obtain no more than expected results.

In the absence of a showing to the contrary, the manipulation of particle size is deemed to be no more than a matter of choice and at most optimization. Certainly, one of skill in the art could readily determine if a particle size is too large or too small for the use at hand.

Application/Control Number: 10/723,784 Page 5

Art Unit: 1794

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leslie Wong whose telephone number is (571)272-1411. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 571-272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Leslie Wong/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794

LAW October 10, 2008